

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
WATER QUALITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, May 1, 2008
MAG Office Building
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

* Roger Klingler, Scottsdale, Chair	# Stephen Bontrager, Peoria
* Marilyn DeRosa, Avondale	Glenda Novak for Robert Hollander, Phoenix
David Johnson for Lucky Roberts, Buckeye	Rich Williams Sr., Surprise
# Jacqueline Strong, Chandler	* David McNeil, Tempe
* Dave Emon, El Mirage	# Kevin Chadwick, Maricopa County
# Lonnie Frost, Gilbert	* John Boyer, Pinnacle West Capital
Russell Fletcher for Chris Ochs, Glendale	* Ray Hedrick, Salt River Project
David Iwanski, Goodyear	* Erin Taylor, U of A Cooperative Extension
# Bill Haney, Mesa	Michael Byrd, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

#Attended by telephone conference call.

OTHERS PRESENT

Kathy Haines, Goldfield Ranch resident	Al Dreska, Parsons
Randy Haines, Goldfield Ranch resident	Carol A. Johnson, Parsons
Chris Henninger, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality	Robert Shulz, Burns & McDonnell
Edwina Vogan, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality	Roger Greaves, Burns & McDonnell
Joanne Rhyner, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality	Tom Avayfuay, Garney Construction
Jessica Marlow, Town of Cave Creek	Julie Hoffman, Maricopa Association of Governments
	Patrisia Magallon, Maricopa Association of Governments

1. Call to Order

A meeting of the MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee was conducted on Thursday, May 1, 2008. David Iwanski, City of Goodyear, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at approximately 3:02 p.m. Bill Haney, City of Mesa; Jacqueline Strong, City of Chandler; Lonnie Frost, Town of Gilbert; Kevin Chadwick, Maricopa County; and Stephen Bontrager, City of Peoria, attended the meeting via telephone conference call.

Julie Hoffman, Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG), introduced Michael Byrd, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, as a new member of the MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee.

2. Agenda Announcements

Acting Chair Iwanski provided an opportunity for member agencies to report on activities of interest in their agencies.

3. Call to the Audience

Acting Chair Iwanski provided an opportunity for members of the public to address the Committee on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG or items on the agenda for discussion but not for action.

Acting Chair Iwanski recognized public comment from Kathy Haines, Goldfield Ranch resident. Ms. Haines discussed the MAG public participation program of the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan. She said the objective is to solicit from the public their opinions and perception of problems, issues, concerns, and needs. Ms. Haines defined the term solicit as to seek for something by entreaty, by earnest or respectful request. She referred to the Draft Small Plant Review and Approval for the Preserve at Goldfield Ranch Water Reclamation Facility discussed at the March 20, 2008 MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee meeting. Ms. Haines stated that public input was not solicited. She mentioned adjusting the public participation program. Ms. Haines stated that she can provide critical facts with regard to the Goldfield Preserve project. She said that the site for the water reclamation facility has moved and is now wedged on a peninsula surrounded by jurisdictional washes. Ms. Haines commented on the facility meeting only one third of the future needs. She also discussed hauling sludge off-site and the community within three miles of the facility. She stated that public input is most critical when a municipality is not involved with the facility. Ms. Haines commented on the Committee's recommendation on the project. She discussed having a public participation program with prominent indication of public solicitation. Ms. Haines stated that although informative, MAG needs to do more than have a passive website. Acting Chair Iwanski thanked Ms. Haines for her comments.

4. Approval of the March 20, 2008 Meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the March 20, 2008 meeting. David Johnson, Town of Buckeye, moved and Glenda Novak, City of Phoenix, seconded, and the motion to approve the March 20, 2008 meeting minutes carried unanimously.

5. Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the Town of Cave Creek Water Reclamation Facility

Roger Greaves, Burns & McDonnell, provided a presentation for the Town of Cave Creek MAG 208 Plan Amendment. He presented a regional map showing the location of the Cave Creek Water Reclamation Facility (WRF). Mr. Greaves also provided a map of the service area for the facility which is approximately 42 square miles. He discussed the areas that are currently sewered. Mr. Greaves presented the population projections for the Town of Cave Creek. He indicated that by the year 2030, the population for the Town is projected to be 9,656. He added that the total projected wastewater flow in the year 2030 will reach to 1,788,622 gallons per day.

Mr. Greaves stated that the existing Cave Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant was installed in 1998 with an original capacity of 0.233 million gallons per day (mgd). He mentioned that due to high BOD and TSS loadings, the plant has been derated to a capacity of 0.133 mgd. He added that the current average daily flow is 0.130 mgd and therefore the plant is at its limit. Mr. Greaves discussed the current Aquifer Protection Permit (APP) and Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AZPDES) Permit for the existing plant. He mentioned that reclaimed water generated by the Town of Cave Creek is discharged to the Rancho Manana Golf Course ponds. Mr. Greaves stated that the existing plant will be decommissioned once the new facility is operational. Mr. Greaves discussed the proposed Cave Creek WRF. He added that the facility would have an initial capacity of 0.75 mgd and an ultimate capacity of 2.25 mgd. Mr. Greaves indicated that the facility would produce Class A+ effluent. He mentioned that the facility's initial disposal options would be to the golf course ponds and an emergency overflow to Galloway Wash which is tributary to the Cave Creek Wash. Mr. Greaves stated that an additional AZPDES Permit may be obtained for the Cave Creek Wash. He added that the dewatered biosolids would be hauled to a landfill.

Mr. Greaves stated that the Cave Creek Water Reclamation Facility would have an influent pump station and mechanical screen. He added that the facility would also have grit removal. Mr. Greaves mentioned that the process would be a Sequencing Batch Reactor (SBR). He indicated that the facility would have tertiary filtration, chlorination/dechlorination, an effluent pump station, sludge holding tank and sludge dewatering. Mr. Greaves stated that the facility would have odor control for buildings and basins. He added that they have gone to great lengths to make sure residents cannot hear, see or smell the facility. Mr. Greaves mentioned that the facility would have standby power. He mentioned that for noise control, the facility would have berms and enclosures. Mr. Greaves stated that there would be a trunk line from the existing wastewater treatment plant to the water reclamation facility. He added that the reclaimed water would go back to the golf course.

Mr. Greaves discussed the site plan for the Cave Creek WRF. He provided a mature landscape of the projected Cave Creek Water Reclamation Facility. Mr. Greaves showed the locations of the Cave Creek Wash and Carefree Highway in relation to the proposed facility. He discussed the construction phases. Mr. Greaves stated that phase one will be operational in October 2009 with a capacity of 0.75 mgd. He added that phases two and three, 1.5 mgd and 2.25 mgd, respectively, would be developed as required. Mr. Greaves mentioned that the Town has undertaken the first phase of the WRF as a design/build/operate (DBO). He indicated that the team includes Garney Constructors, Burns & McDonnell, and Arizona American. Mr. Greaves commented that Arizona American would operate the first phase of the WRF for the first two years. He added that at the end of the two years, Cave Creek would have the option to operate the facility themselves or contract with a company for the operation.

Mr. Greaves discussed the permits required for the facility. He also mentioned facility financing. Mr. Greaves stated that the first phase would be financed through a Town bond election. He indicated that funding has been obtained from the Water Infrastructure and Finance Authority of Arizona (WIFA). Mr. Greaves mentioned that the loan would be repayed with user fees, connection fees, development fees and sales tax revenue.

Rich Williams, City of Surprise, inquired about the high strength waste mentioned in the presentation. Mr. Greaves responded that the design BOD level is 470 milligrams per liter (mg/l)

and the TSS level is 570 mg/l. He stated that a lot of the high strength loadings are produced from the restaurants. Mr. Greaves added that the Town of Cave Creek does have a pretreatment ordinance in place and are taking steps to decrease the loads. Mr. Williams commented on the SBR process and inquired about the provision for upsets. Mr. Greaves replied that the SBR has two basins. Therefore, if one basin is upset, the other basin is flow through and treats all the wastewater. Ms. Novak commented on the chlorine contact basin and inquired about the products that would be used. Mr. Greaves responded that sodium hypochlorite would be used as the disinfecting agent and sodium metabisulfite would be used for dechlorination.

Lonnie Frost, Town of Gilbert, inquired about the disposal options listed in the amendment. Mr. Greaves responded that the Cave Creek WRF plans to reuse at the Rancho Manana Golf Course and discharge to the Galloway Wash. He added that an additional AZPDES Permit discharge would be obtained to the Cave Creek Wash if required. In addition, the Town of Cave Creek is exploring other areas for reuse. Mr. Frost inquired if there was intent to recharge. Mr. Greaves responded no, not at this time. Mr. Williams moved to authorize that a public hearing be conducted on the Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the Town of Cave Creek Water Reclamation Facility. Russell Fletcher, City of Glendale, seconded and the motion was unanimously passed through a roll call vote by the Committee.

6. Arizona Construction General Permit for Stormwater Discharges

Christopher Henninger, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, provided a presentation on the AZPDES Construction General Permit. He discussed the history of the stormwater permitting program. Mr. Henninger mentioned the AZPDES Permit which began at ADEQ in 2002. He also stated that the AZPDES Construction General Permit has a five year lifespan and became effective on February 29, 2008. He discussed the acronyms used by ADEQ such as AZPDES, the Construction General Permit (CGP), the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), Notice of Intent (NOI), Notice of Termination (NOT), Best Management Practice (BMP), and the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Mr. Henninger stated that he would present the differences between the draft and final permit. He added that there were a few changes made between the 2003 and 2008 permit documents. He mentioned that ongoing construction will have 120 days to transfer coverage.

Mr. Henninger indicated that the draft permit had no provision for default authorization. He added that the final permit includes a default authorization of seven days after receipt of the NOI. Mr. Henninger indicated that the operator must submit the default authorization in a manner to confirm the Department's receipt. He stated that for ongoing construction, the draft permit included 90 days to reapply for the permit. Mr. Henninger added that the provision was extended in the final to 120 days; however, the SWPPP must be updated to the 2008 permit within 90 days. He discussed the permit requirements related to the Arizona Board of Technical Registration (BTR). Mr. Henninger mentioned that the draft included that in preparing the SWPPP, the operator must comply with the BTR requirements. He indicated that the statement was removed from the final; however, it does not relieve the duty to comply with requirements if the BTR determined it applicable.

Mr. Henninger discussed the inspection schedule in the permit. He stated that the draft increased the inspection frequency during monsoon seasons and deleted the 28 day dry weather inspection

frequency. He added that the final permit included the inspection schedule that is consistent with the former permit except with the deletion of dry weather. Mr. Henninger mentioned that in the draft permit, certain BMPs were required to be maintained within 24 hours. He gave the example that silt fencing is used to retain sediments. Mr. Henninger commented that the final document changed the BMP maintenance to be seven calendar days or before the next anticipated rain event (whichever is sooner). He stated that the draft permit had the provisions for bypass and upsets removed since they were addressed in the Arizona Revised Statutes. Mr. Henninger indicated that these standard permit conditions were added back to the final permit pursuant to 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 122.41 (m) and (n).

Mr. Henninger discussed the definitions that have been added to the permit which include receiving water, rain event, business day, and day. He indicated that ADEQ received many requests for the definitions. Mr. Henninger discussed the ADEQ response to comments on concrete washout, vehicle and equipment washdown areas, sediment and erosion controls, stockpiles, perimeter controls, SWPPP availability, inlet protection and monitoring plans. He mentioned concrete washout and the washdown of equipment such as trucks, pumps, mixers, tools and wheelbarrows. He discussed the conditions that are met for concrete washout as part of the APP General Permit. Mr. Henninger presented pictures of proper and improper concrete washout disposals.

Mr. Henninger discussed vehicle wash down. He stated that the permit removed vehicle washing as allowable non-stormwater discharges. Mr. Henninger added that the permit removed it in order to be consistent with the APP permitting rules. He mentioned that if vehicle equipment washing is conducted, the operator must comply with A.A.C. R18-9-303.

Mr. Henninger commented on sediment and erosion controls. He stated that an erosion control covers a surface to prevent erosion. Mr. Henninger discussed the measures for stabilization which include vegetation, mulch, erosion blanket, rock/rip-rap and soil binders. He mentioned that a sediment control captures sediment that an erosion control has failed to keep in place. Mr. Henninger added that the measures for sediment control are typically at the perimeter and include silt fencing, berms, sediment basins/traps, and fiber rolls. He presented examples of erosion and sediment controls. Mr. Henninger stated that the permit requires the implementation of both sediment and erosion controls. He mentioned that the suite of BMPs included in the SWPPP is to reflect site specific conditions. He stated that the permit language has been revised to keep sediment on site “to the extent practicable” instead of achieve “maximum pollutant removal.”

Mr. Henninger mentioned that the area must have temporary or permanent stabilization within 14 days of the most recent land disturbance where construction activities have ceased. He stated that projects located within 50 feet of impaired or unique waters shall initiate stabilization practices within seven calendar days of inactivity. Mr. Henninger discussed the meaning of unique and impaired waters. He commented on stockpiles and noted that the former permit did not have this requirement. Mr. Henninger indicated that soil stockpiles are pollutant sources that create an overall increase in the surface area of exposed soils, along with severe slopes that contribute to increased sediment transfer. He added that sediment control BMPs are necessary to reduce potential increases in pollutant discharge and are required by the permit, except when stockpiles are actively being worked. Mr. Henninger mentioned that stockpiles must not be placed in streets, washes, sidewalks or other conveyances. He also discussed perimeter controls.

Mr. Henninger discussed SWPPP availability. He indicated that the SWPPP shall be on site whenever construction or support activities are actively underway and shall be locally available to the Department or any other federal, state or local authority having jurisdiction over stormwater discharges from the project. He mentioned that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has prepared a resource for developing a SWPPP. Mr. Henninger mentioned inlet protection. He added that the final permit was revised to require inlet protection to all storm drains that discharge, or could discharge, to waters of the U.S. or to a local MS4 until all sources with potential for discharge to the inlet are stabilized.

Mr. Henninger discussed monitoring plans. He indicated that operators of projects within a 1/4 mile of unique or impaired waters shall prepare and implement a monitoring program. He indicated that the site-specific program is to include both visual and analytical monitoring. Mr. Henninger mentioned that monitoring plans shall be kept as part of the SWPPP as either an appendix or separate section. He added that this is not a new requirement; however, due to the nature and frequency of questions asked, detail has been added to this section to provide clarity.

Mr. Henninger stated that ADEQ has developed an online smart NOI system. He added that the NOI system is currently down but will be up again in three to four weeks. Mr. Henninger mentioned the information provided in the permit related to inspections. He stated that an example inspection form is provided in Appendix A of the permit. Mr. Henninger mentioned that ADEQ is currently working on a SWPPP checklist which will be the same checklist used internally to review SWPPPs. He added that the permit will encourage permittees to keep a checklist in front of the SWPPP completed with appropriate corresponding pages.

Mr. Williams commented on contractors using small kiddie pools as washout basins. He inquired if this option complies with the permit. Mr. Henninger responded that the method could meet the requirements; however, it depends on what happens to the material afterwards. Mr. Williams commented on there not being a discharge and the water evaporating to leave a solid or semisolid material. Mr. Henninger responded that would be okay if the rinsaide is not coming into contact with the ground. Ms. Novak indicated that the City of Phoenix has a facility on Indian Lands and inquired if ADEQ has any jurisdiction in this location with regard to the permit. Mr. Henninger responded that ADEQ does not have jurisdiction on Indian Country. He added that Indian County is permitted through EPA.

7. Call for Future Agenda Items

Acting Chair Iwanski asked for suggestions on any future agenda items. With no further comments, he thanked the Committee for participating and called for adjournment of the meeting at 3:55 p.m.